



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

inside of the front cover of the Advocate of Peace that the members of the American Peace Society could but accept them in all their fullness. We respectfully suggest that now the Democratic Party adopt the same program and make it unanimous.

## THE INEVITABILITY OF WAR

WAR is thought by many to be the inevitable fate of man. It is openly agreed now in a number of quarters that when we were told that this war was a "war to end war" that we were lied to. The "war for peace," Lloyd-George's "never again," were mere catch phrases. The from twenty to thirty wars now going on simply corroborate the belief that war is inevitable. We must keep fit and ready for the big wars now on the way. Our military, air, and naval supremacy are being challenged in various places of the world. Such are the views held and expressed by the Field Marshal of Great Britain, Chief of Staff, Sir Henry Wilson, views which he candidly expressed at the annual meeting of the Union Jack Club, London, May 19. From conversations with army officers in this country, we have no doubt that the British Chief of Staff has simply expressed the views of the American army officers. Marshal Foch has recently expressed his belief in the inevitability of war. The inevitability of war is the cardinal principle of the warrior class and of other people the world around.

It is not necessary to look far for further evidence that under conditions as they now are war is the inevitable fate of us all. The failure of the League of Nations to prevent or to stop the war between Poland and Russia; the many evidences that England, upon closer examination of the League of Nations, recants and turns to the position taken by the majority of the United States Senate; the condemnation of the League by the Republican Party in convention assembled, such facts have led persons of a certain type to despair and to conclude that war is inevitable now and forever more. Is it not true, they ask, that all animals make war; that therefore it is the natural thing in animal economy, including human animal economy? J. A. Thomson, thought by many to be the greatest living authority on heredity, once referred to the war of extermination waged by the brown rat against the black rat in Europe. Referring to this, a writer in Australia has recently remarked that man apparently prefers "the example of the rat to the teachings of Christ." But the point is that many men accept as a fact the inevitability of war.

But there are other facts. International organization is nearer of realization today than ever before. As pointed out elsewhere in these columns, the Republican

Party favors it and pledges itself to work for it. Of course, the Democratic Party will do the same. An association of nations—a society of nations, as we prefer to say—an agreement of the States forming such a society that no nation shall of right take a preponderating part in it, such a society is inevitable. In other words, a society of nations where no great or small powers shall contend and dominate because of their size merely, but where all together shall concern themselves with the welfare of the whole, that is the aspiration of thinking men everywhere.

Two American citizens are now in Europe doing their share to finish the great task all but completed at The Hague in 1907, the task of creating a judicial union of the nations to which all civilized nations and self-governing dominions shall be parties, a union pledging the good faith of the contracting parties to submit their justiciable disputes—that is to say, differences involving law or equity—to a permanent court of this union whose decisions will bind not only the litigating nations, but also all parties to its creation. The names of these men are Elihu Root and James Brown Scott. There are facts opposed to the argument that war is inevitable.

As for the proposition that all animals make war, the reply is that they do not. The well-known Thomson was mistaken about the rats. The Secretary of the London Zoölogical Society, Mr. Chaloner Mitchell, has recently shown that the common notion that one species of animals exterminates other species by means of fighting has no foundation in fact. Indeed, there is not now, neither has there been, any war between one species and another species of rat. There is no war among the lower animals. That some animals eat other animals for food is not to say that this is a part of the game of war. We would not say that man wages war upon cows and sheep for his beef and mutton. In the game of war—that is to say, in the game of organized killing of group by group—man stands alone. If war is inevitable, we must seek for its inevitability, not in the nature of the animal world outside man, but within the nature of man himself. Whether the nature of man is of such a texture that he must forever organize himself for a continuous warfare upon other members of the same species is for the present a matter of opinion. Our own opinion is that war is no more inevitable than is duelling, drunkenness, feud law of clans, or other tom-foolery.

We do believe that the existence of a warrior class in the various nations does tend to promote war. Evidently the framers of the United States Constitution felt the same way. In Article I of that most valuable instrument, the Congress made up of civilians is the body with authority to declare war, to grant letters of

marque and reprisal, and to make rules concerning captures on land and water. In Great Britain this power is the exclusive prerogative of the Crown. In the Constitutional Convention of 1787, Mr. Pinckney proposed that the power should reside in the Senate, as did Mr. Hamilton. Mr. Butler believed that the power should be given to the President. It was finally and unanimously decided to give it to the Congress. Furthermore, in order that the civilian control might be assured, it was provided that the Congress should have the power to "raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years." The point of limiting the appropriation to two years, the length of a congressional term, is that the control of the army shall be in the hands not of the professional soldier, but of the civilian population. Evidently the framers of the United States Constitution did not propose to place the control of government policy in the hands of the warrior class for the reason that they proposed to avoid war. They succeeded in showing the way to avoid war. They evidently did not believe in the inevitability of war. Because of their work we no longer believe in the inevitability of war.

### PRACTICAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

A CONFERENCE on public health has been held in the City of Brussels, in consequence of which we are nearer to a realization of our efforts in behalf of an internationalization of the campaign against disease. The watchword of the conference was international co-operation. Professor Adami pled for an international classification of bacteria, calling attention to the confusion which is inevitably arising because of the present inadequate classification and to the importance of progress therefor in a great and fruitful field of scientific research. He went on to point out that if each nation adopts a new and separate classification, the confusion will be worse confounded. He emphasized especially the importance of evolving an international method with world-wide standards. Lord Dawson of Penn also explained the urgent relation in every country of the physician to the State. His point was that the details of this relation must, no doubt, be locally determined, but the principles underlying the relation were universal. Then, each nation could help all of the others to a solution. Here certainly is practical international effort.

We now have an International Police Chiefs' Association. Before the Police Convention recently held in Detroit, plans were developed for the exchange of motion picture films, photographs, and literature with the police of old-world capitals to the end "that the organized

forces of order in the world may present a united defense against crime." As one of the best known of America's police experts phrases it, "If the weakened peoples are to recover and to resume their governments, their police must prevail. They look for sympathy and encouragement. Let us have the police of London and Siam and Japan and Peru and Poland known to us personally. Such an association would simplify the capture of fugitives and insure the public a much higher degree of protection from international law breakers." Such a league to enforce peace is defensible in logic and in fact. The law operating upon individuals for the protection of society is a police function, very much needed just now, and destined to be made increasing use of, as men collectively vision the principles of a governed world.

### THE HIGH COST OF ARMAMENT

WHEN Congress adjourned, June 5, it had made appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1 aggregating more than four billion dollars. To be sure, this is a much smaller sum than the \$25,598,967,517 which were spent during the year closing July 1, 1919. But, at the same time, prior to our entrance into the war, in 1917, the total sum appropriated, exclusive of the postal service, had been \$678,677,858.

Economic conditions at home and abroad being as they are, with the high cost of living what it is, and the insistent demand of the people for reduced taxes never so full-throated and bitter, we might have supposed, with some show of hope and reason, that the lawmakers would begin to cut down naval and army appropriations. Have they? Yes, if the demands of the army and navy officials are a test. But what of the popular demand? For the year ending June 30, 1921, the sum of \$828,000,000 is appropriated, which is considerably more than the sum demanded for the entire national budget prior to 1917. The bearing of this fact upon American international relations is no less important than its domestic influence. At home, it is bound to add to the revolutionary mood of the groups that are being selected to bear a maximum share of taxation, whether in old or new forms. Abroad, it creates suspicion of our sincerity in preaching fraternity among the nations. Ministries facing the dimensions of our military expansion do not feel like making reductions that economic necessity demands. The masses of Europe, much as they owe us for relief dispensed by the Red Cross and by the Hoover Food Administration, cannot but know that our failure to lead in the process of disarmament thwarts them in their pressure to rid Europe of its intolerable burden. The same may be said of the foes of militarism in Japan, who are fighting a brave fight against heavy odds.